



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

① DBP ② RRT

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/403,472 | 01/05/2001 | Yochay Danziger | 36256/DBP | 7331 |

7590

05/08/2003

D Bruce Prout
Christie Parker & Hale
PO Box 7068
Pasadena, CA 91109-7068

RECEIVED

MAY 12 2003

Christie, Parker & Hale, LLP

EXAMINER

RODRIGUEZ, ARMANDO

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2828

DATE MAILED: 05/08/2003

ABE # 36256 ACTION 3 Mon O.A.
EMINDER 8/8/03 DUE DATE 11/4/03
EADLINE 11/4/03

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/403,472

Applicant(s)

DANZIGER ET AL.

Examiner

Armando Rodriguez

Art Unit

2828

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.138(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status


- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 February 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 463 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.


PAUL IP
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see pages 6 and 7, filed February 10, 2003, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1 under 35 U.S.C 102 (e) have been fully considered and the argument which pertain to the custom phase adjustment element (127) are persuasive. The examiner agrees with the applicant as to the phase element (127) not being discontinuous since Leger discloses it as having a sinusoidal shape. However, applicant attention is directed to figure 4A, which illustrates an embodiment including a custom phase adjustment element (129) as having a pseudo-random phase shift, which implies discontinuity, see column 7.

The examiner does not agree with applicant's argument on page 7, pertaining to the discontinuous phase element of the present invention, where applicant refers to the discontinuous phase element as "the mode is determined essentially solely by the discontinuous phase element recited in claim 1". There is no claim language within claim 1 or any of the claims dependent of claim 1 that recite such a limitation the claim only portrays the discontinuous phase element as providing a phase change to the mode which propagates within the resonator, therefore the claim implies that mode selection may be obtain by other means, as understood by the examiner.

Acknowledgement of applicant's filing of Terminal Disclaimer to obviate double patenting rejection.

Examiner withdraws the claim objection of claim 3 based on applicant's amendment of claim 3.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:


A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in-

(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or
(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

Claims 1,2,4,5,7,11,12,14-22,24-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Leger (PN 5,745,511).

Figure 4A illustrates a static discontinuous phase plate (129) placed between reflectors (124,121) within a resonator of a laser system to provide phase adjustment and modal discrimination. As disclosed in column 7 lines 39-60, custom phase-adjustment element 129 provides enhanced modal discrimination by introducing a phase shift, which varies in a pseudo-random manner which implies discontinuity as shown in the figure with the sharp peaks and discontinuous shape.



Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3,6,8-10,13,23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leger (PN 5,745,511), Fink (PN 5,283,796) and Harris (PN 3,605,039).

Regarding claims 3,6,8-10,13,23.

The different types of resonators as stable and unstable using phase plates are well known in the art as disclosed by Leger.

Phase plates used in a transmission or reflection mode are well known in the art as disclosed by Fink.

The uses of phase plates in passive resonators are well known in the art as disclosed by Harris.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Armando Rodriguez whose telephone number is (703) 308-6218. The examiner can normally be reached on 10-hour day / M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul Ip can be reached on (703) 308-3098. The fax phone numbers for the

Application/Control Number: 09/403,472

Art Unit: 2828

Page 5

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 308-7721 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-4881.


Armando Rodriguez
Examiner
Art Unit 2828


Paul Ip
Supervisor
Art Unit 2828

AR/PI
May 2, 2003